UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/764,220	01/19/2001	Bum-hee Lee	1293.1161	7430

21171 7590 03/23/2006

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER	
LANEAU, RONALD	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
3627	

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/764,220	LEE, BUM-HEE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ronald Laneau	3627	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 October 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

1. The response filed on 10/5/05 has been entered. Claims 1-13 remain rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondoh, et al. (2001/0056377 AI) in view of Moore (6,330,575 B1) and further in view of Brohoff (US 6,108,533).

Kondoh teaches an integrated Internet shopping mall management system (2-cybennallserver) wherein product order information is received at a cyber agency shopping mall (8-cyber shop information through 83 and. 84), corresponding to an off-line agency which a customer selects, and the offline agency delivers the ordered product (31 and [0165]- in combination with), the shopping mall management system comprising:

A customer web browser that receives product order information and payment information from the customer and provides the product order information and payment information through Internet (Fig. 1-12; [0165]);

An agency web browser that receives agency product information from an agency and provides the agency product information through the Internet, and receives paid order information through the Internet and displays the paid order information (Fig. 1 - 31 utilizing 7);

A shopping mall web server that forms a cyber agency shopping mall for each of a plurality of agencies; provides the agency product information received from the agency web browsers, corresponding to respective cyber agency shopping malls, to the customer web browser; and receives the order information from the customer web browser through the Internet (Figs. 1, 2, 4 and 5 [0001], [0044]-[0212]; and

A payment server that receives order information from the shopping mall web server and, after receives the payment information from the customer web browser through the Internet, handling the payment information for the order [0148]-[0212].

Kondoh teaches that the purchasing process has been preset in the mall and that process after the information was received are outside the scope of the invention and are not described in detail. Arguably, Kondoh teaches a payment server, i.e. the shopping cart system as it fulfills all the functions as set forth in the claims. Kondoh does not teach that the agency, web browser receives paid order information through the Internet and displays the paid order information. Moore teaches an agency web browser that receives product information from an agency and provides the agency product information through the Internet, and receives paid order information though the Internet and displays the paid order information (cols. 4-9). Assuming arguendo, that Kondoh does not teach a payment server, Moore teaches the use of a payment server, i.e. a transaction server in a distributed environment (multiple stores utilizing the same transaction server) (cols. 4-9). Moore teaches that it is complex and expensive to set up an e-commerce server, including that the initial cost is a significant barrier for most small businesses, including the cost of software design and implementation, hardware investment capable of running all three elements of an electronic commerce server for one business (hosting the store

front, maintenance of an inventory and financial database and roll out of a secured Transaction Server); keeping the storefront/catalog up-to-date, providing the ability to easily create, modify and update its own storefront; the requirement to automatically accept secure, electronic forms of payment (cols 2-3, liens 4-20).

Neither Kondoh nor Moore discloses a shopping mall organized according to geographic information of the plurality of agencies or stores but Brohoff discloses a geographic database used in a number of different ways and for example in fig. 4, there is illustrated examples of different applications within shopping mall. The inquiring party is interested in obtaining information from the geographic database concerning the service area. And specific information will be given as to identifying anyone of the establishments and how to reach that particular establishment, i.e. the location within the shopping mall where the establishment is located (cols. 5-6, line 66 to line 26; fig. 4).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have incorporated the features of Moore's agency browser and transaction server into the Cyber Mall Management System taught in Kondoh to complete the purchase processing for the explicit reasons discussed herein above. And it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the information from the geographic database as taught by Brohoff into the combined system of Kondoh and Moore because it would allow a user to identify the location of an establishment with respect to other geographic elements for purposes of supplying it with information from a geographic database.

As per claim 3, Kondoh teaches as set forth above. Kondoh also teaches an agency connecting unit receiving agency product information from an agency web browser through the

Internet (Fig. 1 - 7, 4, 31, 42), and providing paid order information to the agency web browser through the Internet;

A plurality of cyber agency web servers corresponding to a plurality of offline agencies, that, after receiving the agency product information from the agency connecting unit, provide the information to a connected customer web browser (Fig. 2 -- step 112; [0047-0048]; claim 5]);

A customer order handling unit receiving order information from the customer web browser (Fig. 1 - 84); and

A payment server receiving payment information from the customer web browser and handling the payment information for the order [0148]-[0212].

Kondoh teaches that the purchasing process has been preset in the mall and that process after the information was received are outside the scope of the invention and are not described in detail. Arguably, Kondoh teaches a payment server, i.e. the shopping cart system as it fulfills all the functions as set forth in the claims. Kondoh does not teach that the agency web browser receives paid order information through the Internet and displays the paid order information through the agency connecting unit. Moore teaches an agency web browser that receives product information from an agency and provides the agency product information through the Internet, and receives paid order information though the Internet and, displays the paid order information (cols. 4-9). Assuming arguendo, that Kondoh does not teach a payment server, Moore teaches the use of a payment server, i.e. a transaction server in a distributed environment (multiple stores utilizing the same transaction server) (cols. 4-9). Moore teaches that it is complex and expensive to set up an e-commerce server, including that the initial cost is a significant barrier for most small businesses, including the cost of software design and implementation, hardware investment

capable of running all three elements of an electronic commerce server for one business (hosting the store front, maintenance of an inventory and financial database and roll out of a secured Transaction Server); keeping the storefront/catalog up-to-date, providing the ability to easily create, modify and update its own storefront; the requirement to automatically accept secure, electronic forms of payment (cols 2-3, liens 4-20). Thus, it would have been obvious to a one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have incorporated the features of Moore's agency browser and transaction server into the Cyber Mall Management System taught in Kondoh to complete the purchase processing for the explicit reasons discussed herein above.

As per claim 4, Kondoh further teaches a cyber agency connecting unit having at least one hyper link corresponding to at least one web page provided by the plurality of cyber agency web servers, and that connects one of the cyber agency web servers decided by selection information received from the customer web browser, to the customer web browser (Fig. 4; [0030]; Examples 1-4).

As per claim 5, Kondoh teaches that the agency product information includes at least one of a list of products each agency wants to sell and a notice each agency gives to customers (Fig. 6; Example 4).

Method claims 8-10 correspond to computer readable medium claims 13-16, 18-19 and are rejected on the same basis.

4. Claims 2, 7, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondoh in view of Moore as applied to claims 1, 3, and 8 above, and further in view of Brohoff (US 6,108,533).

Neither Kondoh nor Moore teaches that the plurality of cyber agencies are divided according to regions in which each offline agency is located but Brohoff discloses a plurality of cyber agencies such that, when the customer selects one of the regions in a map displayed by the cyber agency connecting unity through the customer web browser, the hyper links of all the cyber agency web servers related to the region are displayed, and the customer is enabled to select the cyber agency web server corresponding to the offline agency the customer wants (fig. 3). Furthermore, Brohoff discloses a shopping mall organized according to geographic information of the plurality of agencies or stores but Brohoff discloses a geographic database used in a number of different ways and for example in fig. 4, there is illustrated examples of different applications within shopping mall. The inquiring party is interested in obtaining information from the geographic database concerning the service area. And specific information will be given as to identifying anyone of the establishments and how to reach that particular establishment, i.e. the location within the shopping mall where the establishment is located (cols. 5-6, line 66 to line 26; fig. 4).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have incorporated the features of Moore's agency browser and transaction server into the Cyber Mall Management System taught in Kondoh to complete the purchase processing for the explicit reasons discussed herein above. And it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the information from the geographic database as taught by Brohoff into the combined system of Kondoh and Moore because it would allow a user to identify the location of an establishment with respect to other geographic elements for purposes of supplying it with information from a geographic database.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 10/5/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the examiner fails to make a prima facie case of obviousness since there is no suggestion or motivation to modify the references or combine reference teachings so as to arrive at the claimed invention. In response to applicant's arguments, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Further, Applicant argues that the Examiner fails to address "an agency connecting unit receiving agency product information from corresponding agency web browsers through the Internet, relating a plurality of offline agencies according to geographic information for display according to a geographic input received from a connected customer web browser" as recited in claim 3. In response to Applicant's arguments, Kondoh discloses a cyber mall which obvious includes a plurality of agencies and customers to deal with and said agencies and customers connect to the cyber mall through the Internet and that provides the connecting unit Applicant is arguing. Applicant further argues that Kondoh fails to disclose "a cyber agency connecting unit having at least one hyper link corresponding to at least one web page provided by the plurality of cyber agency web servers decided by selection information received from the customer web browser. Contrary to

Applicant's arguments, Kondoh discloses in figure 1 a customer web browser 1 which connects to the web server 21 through a link on the Internet. Furthermore, Applicant argues that Brohoff fails to teach or suggest "providing, on request of a customer web browser, an organization of the agencies according to geographic information of the agencies and from which the customer selects in order to select the agency, and providing agency product information of the selected agency to the customer web browser through an Internet." In response to Applicant's arguments, Brohoff is used in combination with other references to disclose a geographic database that contains geographic information about an organization, agency or shop within the mall and customer can browse the Internet to retrieve information about the location, product information

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ronald Laneau whose telephone number is (571) 272-6784. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:30am - 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ronald Laneau
Examiner
Art Unit 3627

3/17/06

rl